



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. VI, 4.

WHOLE No. 24.

---

## I.—THE REDUCTION OF EI TO Ī IN HOMER.

From the fact that there is no great physiological dissimilarity between the diphthongal elements *e* and *i*, their combination in a diphthong *κατ' ἐπικράτειαν* (*ei*, *ēi*) has not been able to maintain itself under all conditions, suffering a change, which, in the case of *ēi*, is assumed to have taken place in the proethnic stage of the Indo-European languages. Johannes Schmidt (K. Z. XXVII 305) has attempted to prove that before a consonant or as a final sound, *-ēi* was deprived of its weaker element, *ē* standing as the representative of the compound (*rās*, Lat. *rēs*, from *rēi*+*s*; locative *-ē*), while *āi* and *ōi* were preserved in their entirety when exposed to similar conditions (*supatyāi tāis*; *populoi vīlku*). However this may be, in the case of *ei*, where the resemblance between the component parts of the diphthong was greater than in that of *ēi*, an assimilation of *e* and *i* took place (the latter sound overpowering the former), which, in Greek, according to Brugmann (Griechische Grammatik, 1885, §15), produced a closed *ē* sound by the end of the fifth century. This closed *ē* sound yielded at an early date in Boeotia ("circa 400," Larfeld, Sylloge, p. xxxiii) and elsewhere in Greece in the third century<sup>1</sup> to that *ī* sound which we meet with in Latin and Gothic as the remnant of the ancient diphthong. In early Latin, it is true, we find traces of *ei* (*deico*, etc.), but in general Latin represents a stage of vocalization in which the ancient diphthongal sounds have lost their primitive coloring, many having become monophthongic. In Gothic the constant representation of the *ī* sound by *ei*, and the occasional use of the same combination to express *ei* and *η*, show that

<sup>1</sup> In Attica the change became general about 100 B. C.

the Gothic diphthong represents the itacistic pronunciation current in Greece at the time of Ulphilas. As regards Brugmann's theory, I think it more probable that the spurious diphthong ( $\epsilon\iota$  from  $\epsilon + \epsilon$  or from compensatory lengthening) was the forerunner of the change, and that it drew in its train the genuine diphthong ( $\epsilon\iota$  from  $\epsilon + \iota$  or proethnic  $ei$ ), since the genuine diphthong continued to be a diphthong at least in Attica during the fourth and third centuries. About 380 B. C. the spurious  $\epsilon\iota$  became diphthongal in character.<sup>1</sup> Whether Brugmann's view or the other here presented is correct, is, however, immaterial to the subject under discussion, which does not purport to give a detailed explanation of the physiology of the sounds  $\epsilon\iota$  and  $\eta$ .

In the first volume of Bezzenberger's *Beiträge* (1877), Gustav Meyer has collected from Homer and elsewhere a number of supposed examples of this reduction of  $\epsilon\iota$  to  $\tau$ ; and in his *Griechische Grammatik* (1880) he has not changed the view maintained in his earlier essay: that we find in so early an author as Homer unmistakable traces of this change.<sup>2</sup> Curtius was also of the same opinion, as may be learned from several passages of his *Etymology and Verbum*.<sup>3</sup> The authority of the epigraphic monuments, as briefly given above, is thus placed in direct opposition to the authority of the Homeric text as understood by Meyer. In his *Grammar* Meyer commits the unpardonable error of comparing itacistic with Homeric forms, assuming that the former are more ancient than the latter because an  $\tau$  found in Homer appears as  $\epsilon\iota$  in inscriptions.

This paper has for its object a new and more thorough investigation of the cases claimed by Meyer and others as examples of the monophthongization of  $\epsilon\iota$ , so far as they are found in the text of the Homeric poems.

The well-known ablaut relations of  $\epsilon\iota$  ( $\epsilon\iota - o\iota - \bar{\iota}$ ) have been treated in full by Saussure, G. Meyer, Bloomfield and others, and latterly (with especial reference to the Homeric forms) by myself in the

<sup>1</sup> After 380 there are but few traces of E for  $\epsilon\iota$ . The last example dates from the year 333.

<sup>2</sup> Frölde, in the third volume of the same journal, seeks (p. 9) to confirm Meyer's theory by adducing other instances.

<sup>3</sup> Cauer's (*Studien*, VIII 252, 1875) assumption that  $\epsilon\iota$  is produced from  $\iota$  in early Attic by a "depravata pronuntiatio" is entirely without foundation. Nor can  $\epsilon\iota$  from  $\iota$  be explained as the modern German  $ei$ , M. H. G.  $\bar{i}$ , according to the theory of Kuhn (*K. Z.* XII 143), Scherer (*Gesch. der deutschen Sp.* p. 39) and others, stimulated by Grein (1862).

treatise "Der Diphthong EI im Griechischen unter Berücksichtigung seiner Entsprechungen in Verwandten Sprachen" (Göttingen, 1885). The material here collected may serve as a supplement to my former paper, and at the same time it has caused me to modify my views of some few positions assumed there. Up to 1881 the prevailing theory was that in certain cases the transition of  $\epsilon$  to  $\tau$ , and through  $\tau$  to  $\bar{\tau}$ , was to be adopted. In that year Osthoff proclaimed in the fourth volume of the *Morphologische Untersuchungen*, in a lengthy essay of 406 pages (without an index), his theory that  $e\bar{i}$ ,  $\bar{i}$ ,  $\bar{\imath}$  are proethnic in both root and suffix-syllables. It is impossible here to enter upon an elaborate criticism of this theory, which in reality is an attempt to overturn in part the hitherto received views concerning Indo-European vocalization. Its corollary is that the proethnic accent was not merely chromatic but also expiratory.  $\bar{i}$ ,  $\bar{\imath}$ , found in individual languages, owe their quantitative dissimilarity, he maintains, not to special laws active in these languages, but to the existence of a universal law antedating the separation of the various groups of the Indo-European family. This law produced three ablaut-gradations of the root: "low,"  $\lambda\bar{\imath}\pi$ ; "middle,"  $\lambda\epsilon\imath\pi$ ; "high,"  $\lambda\omicron\imath\pi$ . According to Osthoff, therefore, all roots which have  $\bar{i}$  or  $\bar{\imath}$  are equally ancient so far as the separate languages are concerned. The  $\bar{\imath}$  root was developed from the  $\bar{i}$  root in the proethnic age. If a verb in Homer has  $\tau$ , in Menander  $\bar{\tau}$ , the one has no quantitative connection with the other; both are equally ancient, and the difference between them is merely one of incidence; the  $\tau$  happens to appear some six centuries before the  $\bar{\tau}$ . Throughout his entire book there is but little account taken of special or specific Greek laws, though compensatory lengthening finds here and there an unimportant place. Of itacism and of the power that certain consonantal sounds have to color or to lengthen a neighboring vowel there is but little mention.  $\kappa\lambda\bar{\imath}\nu\omega$  is not from  $*\kappa\lambda\bar{\imath}\nu\gamma\omega$ , Aiolic  $\kappa\lambda\bar{\imath}\nu\omega$ , but is parallel, so far as the long vowel is concerned, to Old-Norse  $hr\bar{i}n$ , "touch," Germ.  $hr\bar{i}n\acute{o}$ .  $\tau\bar{\imath}\nu\omega$  and  $cin\acute{o}mi$  have mere parallel forms of the same root-vowel. If a form with EI occurs on an early inscription, and Homer has  $\tau$ , the Homeric form is original, and the claims of the EI to antiquity are cursorily dismissed. The phenomena that belong specifically to a language he does not investigate, and the individual development of a language in coloring its vowel-system he seems not to accept. Latin, Gothic and the various Germanic branches, which from the character of their vocalization do not

show the original diphthong *ei*,<sup>1</sup> are made to serve as parallels with their long *i*'s to any Greek or Sanskrit *ī*. A language with the musical accent is judged by the same criterion as another which has the expiratory or has mere survivals of the musical. There is thus no perspective in the book; one language, no matter what the age of its literary monuments, is placed on the same plane as another. A proethnic law which explains all the vowel-phenomena of each individual language is a thing as yet unheard of.<sup>2</sup> Do not the dialects of Greece assert their individuality in their treatment of palatalization? A dull uniformity is made to supplant the elasticity of Greek vocalization. Osthoff fails to see that it is no proof of the non-existence of an Homeric form with EI when he merely cites a supposed parallel *ī* from Sanskrit. The enormous amount of material collected by Osthoff (pages 1-276) in support of his theory is in part worthless, as the laws formulated by him for its explanation are, to a great extent, laws dealing with his conception of sentence-accent, which he fails to illustrate adequately. Sentence-accent played no doubt an important rôle in coloring Indo-European forms, but its laws have hitherto not been conclusively made known. The old and, to my thinking, well-established theory of accentuation whereby, for example, the E sound is expelled by a shifting of the accent, is denied, and the new view proposed that *ī* arose by assimilation of *ei*, *oi*, *ai*, etc., before a consonant when the *ei* did not have the accent; *i* from *ī* if the *ī* syllable became toneless. Itacism, in the general sense of the word, is therefore not a peculiarity of an individual language, it antedates the existence of all individual I. E. languages. *ī ū* before consonants arose, furthermore, from *iī uū* when followed by sonants. *iī uū* arose from the same assimilation of the A element as in *ī ū*, but remained uncontracted because the consonantal function of the second element was necessary. *i* before a sonant = *ī* before consonant; *i* is from *iī* by

<sup>1</sup> We must except the few traces of *ei* in Old Latin, which, earlier than *ai*, *au*, *eu*, *oi*, *ou*, lost its diphthongal nature, as *deivos*, *quei*, *Apolenei*. Even these cases are placed in doubt by Stolz, Lateinische Gram. §37. *i* and *e* are expressed by *ei* sometimes, and *ē* and *ei* are constantly confused.

<sup>2</sup> Osthoff's explanation of the phenomena of long and short vowels fails to recognize the significance for the I. E. vowel-system of disyllabic roots, the existence of which Saussure has rendered probable. Thus the weak form of *✓ geyā* (to use the diacritical representation of Hübschmann, who in his "Indogermanisches Vocalsystem" attempts to mediate between Osthoff's and Saussure's theory,) is *ji*; of *✓ peyā*, *pī*.

the loss of the sonant mora as in the case of *ĩ* from *ĩ*. Such is in brief Osthoff's theory; those who desire a fuller explanation are recommended to the book itself. It is not the place here to discuss "conjectures about conjectures."

We have to deal with *τ*'s that are to be explained by the specific laws of Greek linguistics, with others that were produced by the action of laws of the Greek language, which laws operate also in cognate languages, and lastly with other instances where *ĩ* is Indo-European and found in Greek and elsewhere. It is not asserted that because an explanation for the *ĩ*'s that are collected here is sought in Greek laws, the help of related languages not being neglected, a confusion is established between the science of Greek linguists and the science of Indo-European linguists. The one is embraced by the other. That there are many cases of I. E. *ĩ* in Homer is not denied, and there are *e. g.* some 60 proper names, some of which are property of cognate languages and contain an *ĩ* not yet explained.

The uncertainty attendant upon the explanation of Homeric forms is, of course, materially increased in the case of a sound which suffered itacism. This holds good to a greater or less degree of all texts transmitted to us by the hands of copyists of the itacistic period. We must, therefore, not be misled when our manuscripts appear to preserve ancient forms which are really itacistic, *e. g.* ἀμμείξας in the Papyrus fragment of Ω. I give here a summary of the oldest MSS of Homer with respect to itacistic forms:

1. In the Papyrus fragment of Ω, first century B. C., itacism is not restricted to so few instances as is the case of other old MSS, but runs through the entire MS.

2. Papyrus frag. of Σ, the youngest of the papyri, has no itacistic examples of the confusion of *ε* and *ĩ*.

3. Papyrus frag. of Ν, the oldest of this class of MSS, has no instance of itacism.

4. Ambrosianus pictus saec. V-VI, 11 instances of *ε*-*ĩ*.

5. Syriac palimpsest saec. VI-VII, 17 instances.

6. Venetus A, saec. X, is remarkably pure.

Finally, in the Codex Etonensis, Townleianus, Vindobonensis No. 5, Cantabrigiensis CCC, all younger manuscripts, itacism is very frequent.

Judging from the testimony afforded by epigraphics (and this is the only certain testimony free from the contamination of tradition),

the first instance of Attic<sup>1</sup> itacism is earlier than 300 B. C., the next about 285, and about 100 B. C. itacism is general. In other parts of Hellas the itacistic orthography prevails from the end of the third century. I except, of course, the dialect of the Boeotians, which first indicates graphically the change that was destined to undermine the individuality of a great part of Greek vocalization. From the relation of sound and writing in Boeotia, which is undoubtedly closer than that prevalent elsewhere, we have a good criterion of the pronunciation of particular sounds which is often lacking in other dialects. From the third century on the tendency to itacism obtains with increasing rapidity. For example, in Kaibel's "*Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta*," τ stands for ει 166 times in 113 inscr., ει for τ 420 times in 280 inscr., ει for τ 20 times. No distinction is here made between the genuine and spurious diphthong. ει was originally written for τ alone, but we find that ει stands for τ sporadically after 50 A. D., but after 150 it is quite frequent. In the second century A. D. the distinction between ει and ι had become a "crux orthographica," and even before the birth of Christ it was well-nigh impossible. (Cf. Blass, "*Aussprache des Griechischen*," 2d edition.) If then this uncertainty existed at the time of the writing of the Papyrus fragment of Ω, are we justified in assuming that our text of Homer (which resembles that of the *κοινὰ ἐκδόσεις* issued after the edition of Aristarchus, though there were editions bearing this name before his time) is a trustworthy authority even for the pronunciation of the period of the Alexandrian *διορθωτής*? The Papyrus fragment of Ν dates presumably from the time of Aristarchus, and it is free from itacism; yet I hold that to conclude, in the face of the testimony of the inscriptions, that Aristarchus himself was not liable to error in his attempt to restore a text which should represent those current before the archonship of Euclides, is highly improbable. Assuming that itacism existed in Greece at the time of the recension of Pisis-tratus, what proof have we that the Alexandrians had any knowledge of texts in vogue at that date? It is maintained that Aristarchus collated<sup>2</sup> the editions of Massilia, Chios, Sinope, Argos, Cyprus, Crete, and that of the poet Antimachus (floruit circa 400), whose *ἐκδόσεις* is said to have been based upon several of above mentioned

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Meisterhans, "*Grammatik der Attischen Inschriften*," Berlin, 1885, and the review by O. Riemann, "*Revue de Philologie*," 1885.

<sup>2</sup> La Roche, *Homerische Textkritik*, p. 21, "von A. ist es selbstverständlich, dass er sie selbst verglichen habe."

editions. If one reads the evidence adduced by La Roche in support of his statement, it will be clear that the case is not only not proven, but that it is involved in great obscurity. It is the opinion of many scholars, such as Giese and Wackernagel,<sup>1</sup> that neither Aristarchus nor any of the Alexandrians had any MS authority antedating B. C. 403, when the Ionian alphabet was adopted in Athens. Though Aristarchus had texts before him more authoritative than those in the hands of Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle, Aeschines, etc., which must have been free from itacism, yet, as our vulgata is the vulgata of the first centuries after Christ, we cannot be certain either of Aristarchus' own transcription of the old diphthongal sounds or *a fortiori* whether or not our tradition represents the true reading of the fifth or earlier centuries. We must, therefore, in any given case of Homeric  $\tau$ , later  $\epsilon\iota$ , be in doubt as to whether we have to do with a genuine instance of the weakening of  $\epsilon\iota$  to  $\tau$  dating back to the time of Homer, or whether we are dealing with a case of itacism of a later age.

Furthermore, the testimony of the grammarians, scholiasts and lexicographers is invalidated from the fact that the changed pronunciation affected their statements as to orthography, and from the fact that the latest of them at least spoke according to quantity, disregarding the length of the unaccented syllables. The diversity of testimony may be illustrated as follows: Herodian says that in the adverbs  $\epsilon\iota$  is written after  $\theta$ ,  $\lambda$ ,  $\mu$ ,  $\xi$ ,  $\rho$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\chi$ ,  $\psi$ ; the Anecd. Ox. is at variance with this law; Herodian, whose especial endeavor it was to preserve the old forms, prescribes  $-\tau\iota$ ; Choeroboscus, however, writes  $-\tau\epsilon\iota$ . Nor is the remark unfrequent: "this is written with  $\epsilon\iota$ , others say with  $\tau$ ."<sup>2</sup> And instances like the following are common:  $\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ ,  $\Sigma$  531; Schol. B,  $\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ ; Hesych.  $\iota\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$ . In the course of the following investigation the testimony of the grammarians will be occasionally introduced, though from the foregoing it will be clear that no absolute fidelity to the antique forms is to be expected from them.

It is now my purpose to give a list of all words which I have been able to collect (many being entirely new) as supposed instances of the monophthongization of  $\epsilon\iota$  in Homer; the result of this investigation, which, in view of the difficulties mentioned, must be more or less tentative, will be stated at the conclusion. In Homeric

<sup>1</sup> Such is also the view of Sayce, as I learn from a recent communication.

<sup>2</sup> La Roche's HTK affords a good survey of the inconsistencies of the grammarians, *g.* pp. 184, 345, 259, 260.



times no such confusion existed between the genuine and the spurious  $\epsilon$ , as is an established fact for the latter part of the fifth and for the succeeding centuries. Nor is there any confusion in Homer between genuine or spurious  $\epsilon$  and genuine or spurious  $\eta$ . The supposed monophthongization of  $\epsilon$  refers to that  $\epsilon$  which, in almost all cases, is a genuine diphthong.

#### ADVERBS IN $\epsilon$ , $\iota$ .

##### I. *Forms in Homer.*

These have been inadequately treated by Düntzer, K. Z. 16, and by Kiessling, K. Z. 17; the explanation of the vowel-coloring by the latter is antiquated and neither treatise can be regarded as possessing intrinsic value. The diphthong is here genuine, being equal  $\epsilon +$  locative ending  $\iota$ . The  $\epsilon$  stands in close relation to  $o$  ( $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\theta\mu\acute{o}\text{-}s$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\theta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\text{-}\gamma\omega$ ).

##### A.

$\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\omicron\nu\delta\acute{\iota}$ .  $\epsilon$   $\Theta$  512 CD,  $o$  476 x 304 in many MSS, not  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\omicron\nu\delta\eta$  as composita with  $\acute{\alpha}$ -priv. have  $\epsilon$  or  $\iota$ . The ultimate syllable has the ictus. Reasons for noting the position of the ending in the verse will be given later.

$\tau\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\acute{\iota}$  K 473 6 MSS have  $\epsilon$ . Ictus. Hesiod Theog. 127 - $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ .  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\chi\acute{\iota}$   $\Psi$  377 C  $\epsilon$ ,  $\Psi$  757 A has  $\iota$ , 7 MSS  $\epsilon$ . Ictus.

$\acute{\alpha}\iota\tau\omicron\nu\chi\acute{\iota}$   $\Theta$  197  $\iota$  A,  $\epsilon$  CD. The stem may be a vowel, cf.  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\chi\omicron\nu$ ,  $\nu\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ; if consonantal (cf. *temperi vesperi*) the  $\iota$  has suffered lengthening sub ictu.  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\tau\omicron\nu\nu\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}$  is late. Herodian - $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  II 464, - $\acute{\iota}$  I 505, 512, II 464.

$\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ .

$\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  EI CIA 59, 33; 79, 9; 469. Roehl 375 Chalcidice; 321, 4 Locris; 314 Phocis; 30 Argos.  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  is not supported by Thessalian  $\acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\nu$ , and, though it occurs only on metrical inscriptions (CIG 284, cf. 3806, 4158, 4633, 4700, 4943), is probably to be removed from the text of Homer. J. Schmidt, K. Z. XXV 24, XXVII 306, explains  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\acute{\iota} = \alpha\acute{\iota}F\epsilon\sigma\iota$  from  $*\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma = \acute{\alpha}y\upsilon\varsigma$ , weak stem to the strong stem  $\alpha\acute{\iota}F\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ - in  $*\alpha\acute{\iota}F\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha = \alpha\acute{\iota}\acute{\omega}$ .  $\acute{\alpha}y\upsilon\varsigma$  causes Pott difficulty, as he expects  $*\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon F\iota$  ( $*\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\epsilon F\iota$ ) and not the Cyprian form  $\alpha\acute{\iota}F\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ . But as this word shows in the oldest times a variety of stem-formation (Lat. *aevum*, Goth. *aiveins* adj.;  $\alpha\acute{\iota}\acute{\omega}\nu$  in Homer is from analogy to the  $\nu$ -stems), I do not regard it improbable that  $\alpha\acute{\iota}F\epsilon\acute{\iota}$  has taken its origin from an  $\epsilon/o$  stem. This view is strengthened by the fact

that in case Schmidt's explanation were correct we should have to read *aiFēi* in the text of Homer (which the metre forbids), according to the law that when  $\sigma$  disappears between the vowels  $\epsilon + \iota$ , diaeresis is required except in the case of such words as either form or contain a proceleusmaticus (*τέλειος ἀφνειότατος*).<sup>1</sup>

Schmidt, K. Z. XXVII 299, sees in Thessal. *āiv* as in Lesbic *āi* the neuter-accus. of an  $\iota$  stem, and adduces as an argument against the weakening to  $\iota$  the fact that the Thessal. dialect possesses no  $\nu$  *ἐφέλκυστικόν*. The inscription from Larissa, Collitz, *Dialekt Inschriften*, No. 345 (l. 29, 32, 33, 38, etc.) invalidates his statement. The  $\nu$  in question is the same as in *πέρυσσιν*, etc., cf. Meister 195, and *αὐτῶν* on the recently discovered Gortyn inscription. I find foll. instances of  $\iota$  for  $\epsilon\iota$ : Aiolic CDI 304, 35, 37 (319 B. C.); 238, 12 (180 A. D.) (*ἀεί* 319, 5 before 167 B. C.) cf. Sappho's (96) *αἰπάρθενος* according to Cramer (*Anecd. Paris.* III 321, 22). *αἰσιτοί* CIA II 329, 41 third century B. C.; Boeot. *ἡί* CDI 429, 7. In Homer the  $\epsilon\iota$  is always preserved intact.

The rejection of Schmidt's assumption of an  $-\epsilon\varsigma$  stem for *αἰFēi* does not lead me to assert that an  $-\iota$  stem may not have existed in Greek parallel to the  $\epsilon/o$  stem, nor that this is not found in Thes-salian *āiv*<sup>2</sup> accus. masc. and fem., Lesbic *āi* neuter accus.<sup>3</sup> The plastic nature of this word as regards its stem formation, makes it not unlikely that we shall have to separate certain *āi*- forms from others with *ai* as in Attic *αἰσιτοί* where  $\iota$  is itacistic for  $\epsilon\iota$ . *αἰές*, the form in the Cretan and Laconian, *ἀές* in the Heracleian dialect have not lost the locative case-sign  $\iota$ , which is rarely expelled as a final sound; these forms are neuter accusatives, as *σῆτες*, *χθές*, to *\*αἶος* = I. E. *āivas* = Skt. *āyus*. Cf. also *αὐτοετός αὐτοετεί*, *αὐτοθελής αὐτοθελεί*.

#### B. Ending $-\tau\iota$ , mostly with $\grave{\alpha}$ - $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ - privative.

*ἀμογητί* *ἄειρεν* Δ 637 proves nothing as to the original quantity.—*ἀμαχητί* at end of hexam. Φ 437.—*ἀναιμωτί* v. l.  $\epsilon\iota$  only ω 532 and P 363. Ictus.—*ἀνουντητί* X 371. Ictus.—*ἀνιδρωτί* ο 228. Ictus.—*ἐγρηγορί* K 182. Ictus.—*ἐκητι* *ἀέκητι* form the only exceptions to the original oxytone accentuation of these adverbs.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. my treatise "On the diphthong EI," page 42. *aiFēi* would be a unique exception to the above law, which should perhaps be modified by adding that in the case of certain  $-\iota\eta$  formations  $-\epsilon\iota\eta$  may have become  $-\iota\eta$ .

<sup>2</sup> The Thessalian dialect does not reduce  $\epsilon\iota$  to  $\iota$ . Meister, I 298.

<sup>3</sup> Lesbic offers no trace of an  $\nu$  *ἐφέλκυστικόν* in the inscriptions before the Roman period, cf. Fick, *Odyssee* 32, and *Leipziger Studien*, 1881, Vol. IV.

C. *Ending -σι.*

ἀνωσιτί δ 92. Ictus.—μεγαλωσιτί.—δια- μελεῖσιτί.

Our MSS authority (with the exception of A) in the case of adverbs that show a consonant, except τ, before the locative case-sign, permit the form ει. In the case of -τί the long vowel predominates, assuming that it has not been lengthened pro tempore by the ictus. Only ἀ- ἐκρητι and two in -στί show τ.

II. *Evidence afforded by Inscriptions.*

νηποιεί Amphipolis Cauer<sup>2</sup> 551, 10 about 350 B. C.

ἀσπονδεί Aiolic GDI 315; ἀσπονδί 312, 11 which increases the probability that the ι is long in the two Aiolic forms cited below. CIG 2354 Ceos.—καὶ ἀσυλεί 2053b Thrace; ἀσπονδεί 2056 Thrace; 2256 Samos; 2264 Amorgos; 2675-78 Caria.

αὔθημερεί CIA II 471, 71 first century B. C. is uncertain.

ἀκονιτεί R. 380 Thasos. Herodian wrote -ι.

ἀνατεί CIG 104.

ἀσυλεί CIA I 41, 13 fifth cent.

πανδάμι Lesbian, Cauer<sup>2</sup> 430 B, 3.

ἀσυλι Bechtel, Aeolische Insch. Bezz. Beit. V 61, 10 in Roman characters. The formula ἀσυλι καὶ ἀσπονδί C<sup>2</sup>170 Telos. Cf. CIG 2053. αῖ, etc., have been otherwise explained. αἰσιτοι Attic, may, however, be referred to this class.

ὀνομαστί CIA I 40, 44 (424 B. C.)

(The Doric forms διπλεῖ, τουτεῖ, τηρεῖ, αὔτεῖ, etc., never suffer reduction. The deictic τ in οὔτοσσι, etc., is Skt. *ī* old Bactr. *ī* or *ī̃* and not from ει.)

III. *Evidence afforded by Later Literature.*

(The earliest author is cited for each case.) In comparison with Homer the later literature shows that these adverbs are on the increase.

A. Vowel-stems with -ει as adverbial ending: πανδημεί Aesch.—πανομιλεί Aesch.—αὐτοβοεῖ Thuc., Herodian II 464.—ἀμοθεῖ Thuc.—ἀμαχεί Thuc., αὐτομαχεί Dio Cass.—παμφηφεῖ Cratinus.—πανοικεῖ Plato, οἴκει Menander, with regression of the accent. οἴκει has no immediate connection with οἴκοι as has been frequently maintained. οἴκεῖ

<sup>1</sup> Collitz, "Griechische Dialekt-Inscriben."

= νεγέ.—*αἰτοψεί* Grammarians, Et. Gud. Isidorus; traces of *-i* are rare.—*ἄβουλεί*, *ἀναυλεί* Suid.—*ἄδμωλεί* Suid.—*ἄθροεί* Philes.

B. Vowel-stems with *-i* as adverbial ending: *ἄμισθι* Archilochus, cf. Herodian I 505, 11.—*ἄμοχθι* Aesch., Herodian I 505 *-εί*.—*πανστυδί* Thuc. v. 1. *-εί*. *πασσυδί* Xen.—*γωνυμί* Eurip. v. 1. *-εί*.—*ἄωρί* Aristoph.—*πανοικί* Plato. Phrynichus says that the form with *-εί* was common with the Athenians.—*πανδαμύ* Anthologia Pal. V 44.—*ἐνδομυχί* Hesychius.—*πανορμί* Hesychius.—*ἄθρηνί*, *ἀκιδυνί*, *ἄμετρί* Suidas.—*ἀποινί* Agathias.—*ἀκλαγγί* Longus.—*ἄωνυμεί* and *-ί* Et. Mag.—*ἀπαταγί* Suidas.—*ἄκρονυχί* A. P. 12, from a vowel-stem probably.—*ἐγκυτί* Archilochus, *i*-stem, cf. *cutis*. But *αἰτολεξεί* Clem. Alex., Herodian II 464, and *αἰτοψεί* Gram.

C. Ending *-τί* *-τεί* from verbal adjective in *-τός*:

1. *τ* appears in *ἀνατί* Aesch.—*ἄστακτί* Soph.—*ἀνοιμωκτί* Soph.

2. The short *ι* in the following words may be either from *τ* or transferred from the *τ* of consonant-stems. Besides the *-ες*-stems mentioned below I have found 8 other examples of *ι* from stems ending in a consonant: *ἄβοατί* Pind.—*ἐγκονητί* Pind. no verb. adj. in *-τός*.—*ἐγερτί* Soph.—*ἄστακτί* Soph.

3. Quantity is doubtful in *ἀπονητί* Hdt.—*ἄκοντί* Thuc. (L. and S. *τ*), no verb. adj. in *-τός*.—*ἄνωμοτί* Hdt.—*αἰτοποδητί* Luc.—*ἄδακρυτί* Isocr.—*ἄκριτί* Lys.

4. *-τεί* in *ἀκηνυκτεί* or *-ί* Thuc., *-ει* Herodian.—*ἄκλαυστεί* or *-ί* Calim. (*τ* Draco, 37, 96).—*ἄκμητεί* or *-ί* Joseph.—*αἰτοματεί* or *-ί* Nonnus.—*αἰτοεντεί* Dio Cass.—*ἀνοητεί* Herodian.

*-στι* is always short in the post-Homeric poets, though we find that Herodian (II 464) writes *ἀπλευστέι ἀγελαστεί*, the *ει* of which stands probably for *τ*, as occurs after 50 A. D.

D. Stems in *-ες*. *ἄτρεμί* Aristoph. Ravenn.; Boisson. Anecd. *-εί*—*ἡρεμί* Aristoph. Ravenn.; Boisson. Anecd. *-εί* recte accord. to Dindorf, Stephan. Thesaurus s. v.—*ἄμελεί* Xen.—*αἰτοσετεί* Theocr., Bergk *αἰτοενεί* from *ἔνος*.—*πανεθενεί* Strabo.—*παμπληθεί* Dio Cass.—*παγγενεί* Xanthus.—*αἰτοθελεί* Anthol. Pal.—*ἄβλαβί* Choerob. (*βλάβος* or *βλάβη*).—*ἄτριβί* Pollux (*ἄτριβής* or *τριβή*).—*ἄκραεί*, cf. Steph. Thesaur. s. v. *ἀκράϊς*.

In reconstructing the pre-Pisistratic text of Homer that method is gradually meeting with favor, which, basing its conclusions on the results obtained from a collection of the oldest forms found either in literature or in inscriptions, establishes as Homeric the oldest demonstrable Greek (not Graeco-Italic or proethnic) form. Such is more or less the procedure of Christ, and which met no

little opposition at the hands of Curtius. Nauck's position is peculiar. He at one time adopts correct ancient forms, at another follows the MSS in preferring impossibilities. The statement of the correctness of the method named above does not assume that in each individual instance the Homeric form is necessarily the most ancient.

As regards the special point under discussion the argument is an *a fortiori* one. If the material, here for the first time collected, does not prove that all Homeric adverbs in  $\iota$  (excepting those in  $\tau\iota$ ) from vowel-stems should be written with  $\epsilon\iota$  as the oldest form, it at least places the *onus probandi* upon the shoulders of those who maintain the contrary. Of the adverbs from the authors of the fifth century that show  $\iota$ , at least half have  $\epsilon\iota$  as a *varia lectio*, while fifty, if not seventy-five per cent., of all the forms adduced show the older form. Epigraphic testimony is apodictical proof that in at least two-thirds of the endings  $\epsilon\iota$  was the accepted orthography. Upon what unstable ground do they then stand who maintain that the reduction had taken place in the epic period, that in the fifth century the old form was regenerated to yield in turn to  $\iota$  of the latest grammarians?

In the case of adverbs derived from  $\tau\acute{o}s$ , the reduction from  $\tau\epsilon\iota$  to  $\tau\iota$  has in all probability taken place at the time of the writing down of the Homeric poems, despite the fact that the MSS offer two cases of  $\tau\epsilon\iota$ . The coincidence that  $\tau\iota$  occurs only sub icu remains a coincidence merely. The fact that  $\tau\iota$  is short in a few cases even in Homer; that in the literature of the fifth century we find but one case of  $\tau\epsilon\iota$ , and that with the v. l.  $\tau\acute{\iota}$ , renders more conclusive the argument that  $\tau\iota$  was felt as an ending at an early period, as in  $\epsilon\kappa\eta\tau\iota$ , where there is no corresp.  $\tau\acute{o}s$ . Were it not for the existence of the intermediate  $\tau\acute{\iota}$ , the form  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  might be explained by the accent shifting, which may have been the genesis of many adverbs in  $\tau$ . It need not surprise us that in one class of adverbs we find the reduction to  $\iota$  an accomplished fact, while in another the old diphthong has been preserved. Phonetic laws do not affect all members of a system "at the stroke of twelve," as Curtius was wont to remark. The suggestion should, however, not be suppressed that it is possible that  $\tau\acute{\iota}$   $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$  in Homer has the  $\tau\iota$  of consonant-stems transferred to those stems which end in a vowel. If we should adopt this explanation it would remove even this instance of the reduction, but the ease of an explanation by analogy is oftentimes dangerous to its probability, and a more

conservative and more defensible standpoint is the one maintained above. The *causa movens* of the monophthongization remains veiled in obscurity; and the simple statement that a desire to relieve the heaviness of the syllable made itself felt fails to exhaust the question.

If, however, in the case of  $\tau$  parallel to  $\epsilon$  we admit the existence of the former form in Homer, it is not to be explained as the result of the assimilation of the elements of the genuine diphthong of the case-ending, whatever may be its origin in later times. That in a few isolated cases in the later, and generally in the latest literature the  $\tau$  may have arisen from  $\epsilon$  I will not deny. But that the transformation had taken place in the eighth century B. C. I cannot believe, and for those who shrink from accepting the authority of the inscriptions, poets and historians of the fifth century to such an extent as to correct the text of Homer in the few cases where  $\tau$  appears (excepting  $\tau\acute{\iota}$ ) I will offer another argument based on the origin of the forms themselves. It may be prefaced that two principles appear to be active in the oldest stages of the Indo-European languages:

1. If a preposition, adverb or adjective is united with a substantive to form an adjective, no suffix is necessary.
2. The "secondary suffix *ya*" (to use the common nomenclature, though in reality I doubt the existence of a factor "*ya*" in the formation of this class)<sup>1</sup> is employed if from a substantive ( $-a$ -stem) an adjective is to be derived.

Mahlow ("Die langen Vocale A E O," p. 121) makes the observation that in the case of (1) the  $-a$ -stems become  $-i$ -stems. To be sure we find a few uncompounded  $-i$ -stems existing parallel to the  $-a$ -stems ( $\zeta\acute{o}ka$  RV. later  $\zeta\acute{o}ci$  AV.), therefore forms like *bhadraçoci* RV. are of less value as examples; nevertheless there are a large number of cases where the  $-i$ -stem is first found in composition. In Slavic (*sugubi sugubü*), Keltic (*sutain suthin* from *tan*), Gothic (*ganuogi ganohs*), and in Latin this phenomenon is observed. In Latin there prevails an increasing tendency to transform other stems into  $-i$ -stems, which has even led to the difficulty in distinguishing the consonantal from the  $-i$ -declension. What is there parallel to this in Greek? The Greeks seem to have been disinclined to infuse into their language these  $-i$ -stems, a large number of which they do not possess in the substantive

<sup>1</sup>*ya*-stems are really from the locative  $\iota$  + a paragogic element  $a$ ,  $o$ , etc.  $\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\rho\iota-o-\varsigma$   $\Lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota\mu\acute{o}\nu\iota-o-\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\phi(\epsilon)\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}-\acute{o}-\varsigma$ , etc.

inflection. On the contrary there is constantly present a tendency to adopt the “-ya-stems” (πάννυχος παννύχιος, both in Homer). Cannot these “-ya-stems” have driven out the old adjective -i-stem declension? That it must have once existed we cannot doubt, therefore it may not be unlikely that in πανδημί we have the neuter nominative, in πανδημεί<sup>1</sup> the locative of such an -i-stem, which has been supplanted by πανδήμιος. Adverbs in -ι or -ει are not formed from simple uncompounded adjectives. πάνδημος: *sublimus*: πανδημί (-ει): *sublimis* is the ratio which Mahlow assumes. The fact must not, however, be suppressed that there are difficulties in the way of this explanation, one of which I will briefly mention. If πανδημί be the neuter nom. (or accus.) of an adjective -i-stem, the ultimate syllable should be short so far as Greek is concerned. Can the neuter suffix *a* = Skt. *i* have been dropped, leaving the stem either in the pure short form or with the lengthened stem-vowel? For the *u*-stems we have Skt. *puru* and *puri*, but in Greek no such example, since that adduced by Mahlow is incorrect (γλάφῦ not γλάφῦ Hesiod. Op. 533). For the -i-stems we can discover no case of the long vowel. ὄρνις, εὐκνήμις, μέρμις are = Skt. feminines in -īś<sup>2</sup> and therefore do not belong here.

It is alien to the purpose of this paper to enter into a discussion of the origin of the locative adverb in Indo-European. My purpose in making mention of this theory was this: to show that the monophthongization of *ει* in these adverbs is undemonstrable, and that there is at least a choice between two explanations to account for the existence of -τ- parallel to -ει in the text of Homer; either that -τ- had crept into the text at the hands of the writers of our manuscripts, or that its existence, together with that of *ει*, is morphologically justifiable. Both explanations cannot of course be correct, but to suppress either the one or the other attempt at elucidation would be to lessen the balance of probability against the assumed monophthongization.

<sup>1</sup> Brugmann in his Griech. Gramm. calls πανδημεί “probably” a locative. Pott in B. B. VIII 39 suggests that the -ī of these case-adverbs is comparable to the deictic *ī* of *ννί*, etc. He gives, however, no reasons for his conjecture. The locative readily lends itself to such adverbial use. For Sanskrit cf. Whitney, §1116.

<sup>2</sup> Lanman, “Noun inflection, p. 366. Brugmann’s (Gr. Gramm.) assumption of a form *πόλις* on account of *πολίτης* is without foundation, since -ίτης appears as a pure ending (resulting from contraction?) no matter whether the substantive was an -i-stem or not. Cf. *δοίτης*, etc.

SUPPOSED INSTANCES OF THE DATIVE-ENDING -ει,  
APPEARING AS τ IN HOMER.

Hartel, *Hom. Stud.* I<sup>2</sup> 56 seqq., has sought to prove the existence of the old dative-ending ει in the form τ. G. Meyer (*Gram.* §345) calls this explanation a probable one. The τ occurs in sixteen words in Homer, in each case the -ι being in arsi.

A. The ictus rests upon ι, which is followed by a single consonant: 'Οδυσσῆι 7 times, 'Αχιλλῆι 5, σθένει 5, σάκει 3, ὑπερμένει 3, ἄϊαντι 3, πτόλει 2, πατέρι 2, κράτει 1, 'Αιδι 1, λίθακι 1, κόρυθι 1, νηί 1.

B. The ictus rests upon ι, which is foll. by a double consonant: σθένει 8, 'Αχιλλῆι 3, 'Οδυσσῆι 2, κόρυθι 2.

C. The ictus rests upon ι, which is foll. by a muta cum liq.: 'Αιδι 6, ὑπερμένει 4, 'Αχιλλῆι 3, κράτει 2, σάκει 1, πατέρι 1.

D. The ictus rests upon ι, which is foll. by a vowel: ἔτει 6, 'Ηρακλέει 1, 'Οδυσσῆι 1, σάκει 1.

The curious forms Δι*Φει*τρέφης (*CIA* 402; 447, 53, Wecklein, *Curae Epig.* 39, Herwerden, *Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia*, Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*, 1885, p. 25). Δι*Φει*θεμῖς *Cyprian CDI* 61, 21 (Δι*ΰ*αίθεμῖς 74 is unexplainable), δ 477 διειπετέος *Zenodotus*, *Zenodorus*,<sup>1</sup> seem to offer some support to Hartel's theory. Yet the entire absence of any similar instances renders the existence of an archaic dative in this group of the highest improbability. δι*Φει*- is = *Skt. divé*, which does not appear as a part of compounds (cf. *divi*-, *diva*-, *divas*-). Were εὐδιέστερος, -τατος not young, and therefore analogical forms, I would assume a stem διεσ-; Δι*Φει*θεμῖς would be then similar to the many locative-compounds of *Skt.*<sup>2</sup>

It is *a priori* improbable that this τ is a remnant of the old dative case-ending, for, granted the amalgamation of dative and locative in Greek, these 16 cases are the only instances of the final long vowel. To conjecture with Brugmann (*Gramm.* §82), that the analogy of πῶλτ may have caused the lengthened ultima is to confess oneself afflicted with the "Kinderkrankheit der Analogie"; more probable is his other conjecture, to escape from the assumption of metrical lengthening, which he is however here not disinclined to adopt, namely, that the τ is "a proethnic parallel form to Vedic ĩ in

<sup>1</sup> Choeroboscus cites διηπετής, which must be an incorrect transcription. διίφιλος never with ει as v. l.

<sup>2</sup> So Roediger, *De priorum membrorum in nominibus graecis compositis conformatione finali*, p. 49.



the locative. *tanú(v)-i tanú(v)-i, vaktár-i and vaktár-i*. Whitney, §355, 357, says that *tanvî* occurs "in a passage or two," §371 "the *i* of the locative-singular is lengthened in a few words: *kartári*." Though many of these infrequent forms are very ancient (cf. the locative in Skt. without *i* and such words as *οικογενής*, where *οικο-* serves as *οἴκοι*, cf. *Πυλογενής*), the uncertainty as yet attendant upon such forms is too great to allow definite combinations. In the Veda *a, i, u* are found in the lengthened form even when the metre opposes the change; the probability is that in time all such phenomena will be explained morphologically. It is commonly held that proof of the ictus-influence is seen in the reduplication of the following consonant. Whether any account is to be taken of a singular form hitherto unnoted, *Ἀράθθοιο*, where the consonant seems to be doubled even in thesi (cf. *Ἀράθα Ἀράθης* in later writers), I am doubtful. The form occurs on the famous Arniadas' inscription of Corcyra (Cauer<sup>2</sup> 84), which is of extreme antiquity and contains unmistakable imitations of the epic dialect. Does this *Ἀράθθοιο* belong to the class of words like *ἐνιμμεγάροισι*, as Aristophanes of Byzantium wrote? The *θθ* most probably is for *τθ*. It would seem that comparative philologists would welcome any attempt to stigmatize the metri licentia theory as savoring of antiquatedness, yet Fick, who may be classed among those who are in general conservative enough, and Brugmann have accepted this explanation here, though the latter does not fail to put forward other possible but improbable explanations. Hartel's theory of Homeric versification has met with favor in many quarters. In opposition to Curtius he denies with justice that a few forms which have lost an initial sound should have been the cause of metrical lengthening before others which lost no initial consonant. He maintains on the other hand, that the lengthening of short syllables before words beginning with *λ, μ, ν, ρ, δ, F* is caused in a minority of cases by the assumption of the loss of an initial sound, which is indisputably correct, but in a majority of instances the cause of the lengthening consists in the nature of these six sounds, which once possessed a greater phonetic body, and in the delicacy of the Greek ear, which had the power of recognizing as long a short vowel before a sonant. This increased body of sound inherent in the above-mentioned sounds must, however, even in the Homeric period, have suffered attenuation, since but very few stems offer any proof of this assumption, and, furthermore, there are constant variations in the case of these very stems. Lastly, Hartel must

grant that this thickened body of sound is preserved only under the protection of the arsis. Some instances he explains morphologically, while for others (*δὲ τόξον*) he finds no solution. It is not my purpose to discuss further a question concerning which there will never cease to be a contest between the schools. A renewed and more careful investigation of the whole subject in the light of recent views concerning the origin of the Homeric poems may, I believe, lead to a delimitation of the domain claimed almost exclusively by each and all of the contending theories. For the present at least I hold it to be premature to deny the possibility of lengthening by metrical necessity, and I prefer to place here the above dative-locative forms. In any case, and on this stress must be laid, there is no reason to adopt the view which makes *τ* arise from *ει*. The standpoint assumed here is that the ictus-theory is not to be adopted until all other probable, not merely possible, explanations have been brought forward. In the case of *-τῖ* I preferred to assume the existence of a monophthongized diphthong rather than accept the metrical lengthening of *-τῖ*.

## EI, Ī, Ĩ IN SUFFIX-SYLLABLES IN HOMER.

I limit myself here to *-εῖη -τῆ*. For *-εια -ία* in general see Fick, Bezenb. Beitr. I.

A. *ει*.—(1) *ἀναλκείη* P 320, 337 v. l. *ι*. Nauck *ι*.—*μαντείη* Hymn. Roehl IGA 113, b, 7. Add.—*αἰδρεῖη* v. l. *ι*.—*πολυιδρεῖη* v. l. *ι*.—*ἀγελείη*.—*τηρεῖη*.

B. *τ*.—(1) in arsi: *ἀνίη* Odyss. μ 223, Apoll. *ει*, Hsd. Theog. 611; first traces of *τ* in Sappho and Theognis, later *τ̃*.—*καλίη*, *τ* Theocr. —*κονίη*, λ 600 Φ 271 *τ̃*.

(2) in thesi: *ἀεργίη* ω 251 *ει*, so Bion VI 2.—*ἀτιμίη* Attic *τ̃*.—*ἀκομστίη*.—*ἰστίη* *τ̃* Hymn XXIV, nom. prop. *ἑστῖη* Hsd. Attic.—*κακοεργίη* v. l. *ει χ* 374.—*προθυμίη*.—*ὑπεροπλίη*. Several of the Etymologica *ει*.—*ὑποδεξίη*. *ει* in Ven. A.—*ὑπερησίη*. Many MSS *ει* B 573, ο 254. Apoll. Rh. *ὑπεράστος*.—*ἀνολβίη* Hsd.—*ἀπιστίη* Hsd.

C. *τ̃* (vowel and *-εσ*-stems).—*ἀβλαβίη*.—*ἀγγελίη*.—*ἀγλαΐη*.—*ἀεικελίη -ίη* Apoll. Soph., Eusthatus. Attic *ίη* Jebb ad Elect. 486.—*Αἰολίη*.—*ἀλαοσκοπίη*.—*ἀληθείη*.—*ἀματροχίη*.—*ἀμηχανίη*.—*ἀμμορίη*.—*ἀρματροχίη*.—*ἀρμονίη*.—*Ἄρτακίη*.—*Ἄσκανίη*.—*ἀταλασθίη*.—*αὐτοσταδίη*.—*αὐτοσχεδίη*.—*ἀφραδίη*.—*ἀχυρμύη*.—*βουκολίη* Hymn.—*Δαρδανίη*.—*δεξιή*.—*ἐγχείη*.—*ἐνηεῖη*.—*ἐντροπίη* Hymn.—*ἐπεσβολίη*.—*εὐδικίη*.—*εὐνομίη*.—*εὐκλείη*.—*ἐσχατίη*.—*ζῆφυρίε*.—*ἡλικίη*.—*Ἡμαθίη*.—*ἡσυχίη*.—*θαλίη*.—*κατηφεΐη* Γ 51

v. 1. *ίη*.—*κερτομίη*.—*Δαμπετίη*.—*λοφίη*.—*Λυκίη*.—*μειλιχίη*.—*μαρτυρίη*.—*ματίη*.—*μελίη*.—*ναυτιλίη*.—*νηνεμίη*.—*νοτίη*.—*νωχελίη*.—*όμηλικίη*.—*οίκωφελίη*.—*όσίη*.—*Ούρανίη* Hymn.—*Πιερίη*.—*παρηγορίη*.—*πλανοδίη* Hymn.—*πολυκερδείη*, v. 1. ω 167 *-ίη*, cf. ψ 77 v. 1.—*πολυκοιρανίη*.—*πολυμηχανίη*.—*πρυμνωρείη*.—*πρασίη*.—*πυγμαχίη*.—*σκοπίη*.—*σοφίη*.—*στρατίη*.—*σχεδίη*.—*Σχερίη*.—*ύπερτερίη*. 67 in all, and 16 in *-σίη* apparently from nouns in *-σις*, most of which are not extant.

Of the examples cited, 14 (Iliad 4, Iliad and Od. 1, Odyssey 6, Hesiod 3) have *-ίη*. Of these 3 have τ in arsi,<sup>1</sup> 11 in thesi. It is therefore impossible from this ratio alone that the stress of tone can have produced the lengthening. That a vowel in thesi can be lengthened metri licentia is false, though the theory has been adopted by Stephanus, Buttmann, Spitzner and Hentze.<sup>2</sup> Hartel and G. Meyer take refuge in the deus ex machina jod, to the appearance of which in Cyprian many have rendered their tribute of gratitude. It is absolutely undemonstrable that this sound, which disappeared even in Homer's time (*τρεις*), ever possessed in Homer or in any other Greek author the power to lengthen a preceding vowel. The only possible explanation is that the ι < ει was originally long and was subsequently weakened before a following vowel (cf. *ἦτα λῆτην*). That this change can occur has been proved by L. Meyer (Bezzb. Beit. 1878) and reasserted by Kobilinski (De αιυ vocalium apud Hom. mensura, 1882). Thus \**ἀτιμει-η* *ἀτιμίη* (the form *τιμεία* is found CIG 214, 26, *τιμία* 12, 21, 320 B. C.). τ in thesi is not confined to Homer or Hesiod, but appears in *προεδρίη τυραννίη* Xenophanes, *πολυιδρίη*, *καχεταιρίη*, *ἀπιστίη* Theognis, in the first two of which Bergk writes *-είη*.

The *-ες*-stems offer instances of *ιη*. In the case of several, it is uncertain whether as a matter of fact we have to do with *-ες*- or with *-α*-stems.<sup>3</sup>

It is not surprising that we find *-ίη* for *-είη* in Homer, as some early inscriptions record the change. Between *-ειῶ* and *-ιῶ*, which latter was held by the grammarians to be *ποιητικώτερον*, a change of quantity doubtless furthered the inherent tendency to diphthongal simplification, but in the case of these substantives in Homer the

<sup>1</sup> *κονίη* 6 times in arsi has the long ι of the Aiolic *κονίω*, cf. *ἀδικίω* *πεινίω*.

<sup>2</sup> La Roche defends the form *πολυκερδείη* as an analogy to the *ι* forms in thesi.

<sup>3</sup> Bezzenberger (IV 325) is also uncertain in reference to the form of the stem of many of these words. If *κακοεργίη*, *ἀφραδίη* are really *-ες*-stems it is possible that the stem of *ἀνίη* may be *ἀνες-*; cf. Latin *onus*. The doubt as to the form of the stem renders uncertain the additional exception to the law of diaeresis suggested in the note to page 427.

Ionic coloring of the final vowel gave no assistance to the change. It is furthermore incorrect to assert, as some have done, that the forms in *-ῑ* were produced metri licentia, because some of the *-εῖη* forms would not adapt themselves to the hexameter, *e. g.* (*οἰκωφελίη*). A further instance of weakening under similar circumstances is that of *-εας* to *-τας* *-ῑας* in proper names. For examples see G. Meyer (Bezz. Beitr. I 90). *Τλασία* Fo, Cauer<sup>2</sup> No. 83, and *Δφεωῖα* Cauer<sup>2</sup> No. 71 are cited as the only cases of *τ*: "Αμφῑος is to be ranked with 'Αμφῑων and others in *-ῑων*.

#### NOUNS, ADJECTIVES WITH Ī FOR WHICH EI IS FOUND IN INSCRIPTIONS OR IN THE LATER LITERATURE.

*λίκνον*. Hymn. Merc. 21. Hesychius has the foll. glosses: *νεικητήρ*· *λικμητήρ*. *Μεγαρεῖς*; *νέικλον*· τὸ *λίκνον*. Herodian, II 543 quotes the form with *ει* as being the proper orthography. If these forms are not itacistic they prove the antiquity of the diphthong, which we should expect from its connection with Lith. *nėkoti*.

*ῥῑα* < *ἄφεσja* \**ῥεια*, Skt. *avasām* or to *sasyām*? A word of very doubtful explanation. That the *τ* is under the ictus three times has certainly nothing to do with the quantity, nor is the explanation of *τ* = *ij* tenable. If *τα* is from *εια* < *εσja* it would be the only example in Homer of *εια* from *εσja*. *-εῖος* in Homer if the sibilant has been expelled. (Exceptions, page 427.)

The *τ* of *χῑλοι* is the Hellenistic form and does not properly belong in Homer (*χῑλια*). In later Aiolic inscriptions we find *χῑλ* *e. g.* 332 B. C., but older Aiolic *χέλλιοι*, Doric *χῑλιοι* only once, CIG 1511; Boeot., Ion. *χέλιοι* prove that the *ι* is itacistic. There is no trace of a parallel form \**χῑλλιοι* (as in the case of *ἰληθι* *ἔλλαθι* ✓ *σελF* *σλF*), the reduction of which would give *χῑλιοι*. The common Attic *χῑλιοι* is a witness to the same itacism, and it is to its influence that we owe the existence in Homer of a form dating from a posterior age. The inscription from Chios (Roehl, IGA 381) shows a remarkable variety in the orthography, which must denote the uncertainty in reference to the actual pronunciation which was in the mind of the cutter of the stone, if not of the Chians and others. There are but few examples in old inscriptions where the spurious diphthongal sound is written *ΕΙ*, and though this peculiar orthography is no proof that the word for "a thousand" was even then so much exposed to the itacistic tendency as to necessitate a form like *χῑλιοι* (EIMI, ✓ *εῖς* also on inscriptions before 403 B. C.,

was not affected for two centuries), it substantiates my belief that *χίλοι* is not a very old form, certainly that the long vowel does not extend to the Homeric age. That the form had a peculiar history is furthermore attested by the common Doric form *χίλοι* even in early inscriptions and by Attic *χίλοι*, for of *χείλοι*, stated by Meister to be Attic, I have found no trace.

*νηλίτης* Kayser and Hayman π 317, τ 498, χ 418 as if the root syllable of \**ἀλείτω ἀλῖτεῖν ἀλῖτέσθαι* had suffered itacism. The v. l. show that the MSS are in a state of confusion, but La Roche reads correctly *καὶ αἱ νηλείτιδες εἰσιν*. Cf. his *Hom. Textkritik*, where evidence is adduced that Aristarchus wrote *νηλίτης*.

*ἑτέη* *ἱ. ε. Φτεή*. *Εἰτέα* name of an Attic *dème* CIA I 273b, cf. also *Εἰτεᾶϊος*, II 334d, 20. Blass, *Aussprache*<sup>2</sup> 54, demands as the correct orthography *εἰτέη*, and I see no reason for refusing to accept this as the Homeric form. Herodian *ἑτέα*. Latin *vītis*, Lettic *witūolis* prove merely the existence of the long vowel for these two languages and fail to account for *Εἰτέα*. Cf. Herwerden, "Lapidum de dialecto Attica testimonia," and O. Riemann, *Revue de Philologie*, IX 178.

*εἰλαδόν* *ἱ. ε. Φιλαδόν*. Herodotus *εἰληδόν* I 172 v. l. *ἰλαδόν*; cf. I 73 *εἰλη* v. l. *ἰλη*, Stein. *ἰληδόν* also *εἰληδόν* is found in late Greek (Quint. Smyr.) *ἰλη* is the common Attic, *εἰλη* the Ionic form. *εἰλαρχέω* CIG I 1576 is Boeotian, therefore *ει* = *ι*. *Φιλαρχιόντων* Leake (North. Greece, II 31). *βειλαρμουςαί* Hesychius is either itacistic or from *εἰλω* *ἱ. ε. Φείλω*, Dor. *Φήλω*. Whether *ῥμιλος* belongs, as Curtius maintains, to this group is not beyond doubt. Lobeck considered *-ιλος* to be a suffix, and this is found in *ναυτίλος ὀπτιλος* with different accentuation. Hesychius' gloss *ῥιλη ὀμιλος* points to a Doric form from *Φήλω*. κ 338 we have the v. l. *ῥμιλλος*; cf. *πέδιλον* Ω 340 Papyr. frag. of Ω, Ambros., Syr. palimp. have *ει*; *πέδιλλον* in two MSS. Ω 712 v. l. *ῥμειλος* is itacistic. *ῥμιλλος* is received as an Aiolic form into the text of Sappho by Ahrens (cf. *Dial.* I 58). If this is a genuine form, which I see no occasion to doubt, the *ι* is not from the *ει* of *εἰλω*, and we must accept the rule that *ι* + *λ* in Homer = *ιλλ* in Aiolic = *ιλ* in Attic (*πέδιλον* is a poetic word; Euripides is the only authority quoted for the Attic use). Of the examples cited by Meyer (*Gram.* §293) *πιλος* is doubtful, the others are *πέδιλον*, *ἄργιλος* (Aristotle) and *ἑτελα*, which is \**ἑτιλ-σα*. The *λλ* form in this group is found in Homeric *ἰλλάς* "rope," though Curtius separates ✓*Φελ* "wind" from ✓*Φελ* "press." The genesis of *Φείλω* *Φήλω* and *ἰλλω* is involved in uncertainty. Brugmann (*Griech.*

Gramm.) does not adopt any solution; his attempt (Stud. IV 122) is not satisfactory. The form ἰλλω (Aristoph.) causes the greatest difficulty. This I conjecture to be a weak form:  $F_{\iota}\lambda F = F_{\epsilon}\lambda F$  (Lat. *volvo* for *\*velvo*), from this ἰλη τ'λαδόν. It is possible that as εἰλη and ἰλη existed, so too εἰληδόν and ἰληδόν τ'λαδόν. The weak vowel is often found between  $F$  and liquids ε-*Φιρήνη*, ✓ *Φερ*, ξ-*Φιρος*, ε-*Φιργω* (?) To the root  $F_{\epsilon}\lambda$ , τ'λ ὕς "mud," may be related. Hesychius εἰλύ· μέλαν; ἰλύς· πηλός. ὑποστάθμη; ἰλύσω· ἰλύϊ περικαλύψω. Φ 318-19 contains a play upon the meaning of noun and verb. The adjective may be derived from the strong root-form  $F_{\epsilon}\lambda F$ -; the noun from  $F_{\iota}\lambda F$ -. In εἰλύω the υ is either a conjugational sign or it is the vocalized  $F$ ; cf. *φθίνω* ἰ. ε. *\*φθίνω* *φθινύθω*. Is the latter the case, the ε is prosthetic vowel and ι indicative of the weak root-form (ε-*F*τλ-ύ-ω). In any case I do not see the necessity of deriving the noun directly from the adjective.

It is doubtful whether κίων "column" belongs to κείω "cut," the εἰ of which verb presents difficulties. Fick (Bezz. Beitr. I 333) maintains their connection and that of M. H. G. *schle* "hedgestake." κίων would then stand for *\*σκείων*. κείων occurs on an inscription of the time of Hadrian (CIG 3148), from which we learn nothing as to the original form. A plausible etymology is Armenian *siun* 'column.' *Siun* = *\*sīvan* or *\*sēvan* (Hübschmann, Armen. Stud. p. 49). The τ of κίων (*κίFων*) is then proethnic and not from εἰ.

*Φείκελος* *Φίκελος*. The latter 17 times, the former has the v. l. ε (which is not to be adopted) N 53, 330, 688, Δ 253, Ξ 386, P 88, 281, Σ 154, Υ 423, X 134, κ 304, λ 207, τ 384, υ 88, φ 411, χ 240, Hym. VII 21. *Φίκελος* is not from *Φίκελος* < *Φείκελος* as those who demur to the weakening of ε before a consonant would have to maintain, but is from *Φείκελος* by change of accent. That -os was at one time bearer of the accent is proved by such forms as ἀφ(ε)νεῖός, γεραῖός, cf. γῆρας.

σκή, Skt. *chāyā*. The Hesychian σκοιά· σκοτεινά and Gothic *skēiṁta* make it probable that σκῑά is either from *\*σκεια* through *\*σκτη*, or is the weak form transferred from a weak case as gen. pl. where the accent caused the expulsion of the ε sound. The latter is the more probable supposition.

ἦμιν ὕμιν. G. Meyer (Griech. Gramm. §113) assures us that these forms are "certainly" for ἦμεῖν ὕμεῖν, but, §421, he is uncertain whether the -εῖν represents the older and more correct orthography. The form in -εῖν is met with for the first time 193 B. C. on a Teian

inscription CIG 3045. We find ἡμεῖν CIG 2737, with no other trace of itacism on the inscription. CIA II 547, 17 αῖν preserves the common orthography. Here even Meyer becomes doubtful about the correctness of his general method of argumentation: that forms on later inscriptions are authority for words occurring in an author so remote as Homer. For this sanctification of inscription-forms he is properly rebuked by Blass. The variation in the above words only goes to prove that itacism did not affect all forms, even of the same category, at the same time. The genesis of the dative plural of the pronominal declension is involved in such obscurity (Brugmann in his Griech. Gram. offers no theory in reference to -ῖν) that it is presumptuous to draw any conclusion from testimony of so late a date.

Πολύτδος. The v. l. with εἰ, E 148, has not so good authority as the vulgata reading (cf. also N 663), though the form Πολυεῖδης is found in later Greek (Fick, "Personen-Namen," p. 113). Accepting the reading with the monophthong, the length of the vowel has caused great difficulty. There is no trace of a τ in the root *Fιδ* in Greek, therefore the comparison of the Avestan *vithushi* does not seem pertinent, nor is the analogy of Lithuanian a cogent argument for the existence of the long root-vowel here, which would be a solitary instance. Hartel would doubtless find in the greater body of sound which he supposed the dental sonant to have once possessed, the cause of the apparent lengthening. There seems, however, to be a physiological difference between μ, ν, ρ, λ and δ. Wackernagel (KZ XXV 261) seeks to explain the τ morphologically. Noticing that in many words when Homer has τ, Attic has ρ, the change is to be ascribed to the influence of *F*, he sees in -τδος a remnant of the oldest participial form \*ῖδῶς Hom., = \**FιδFῶς*, \*ῖδῶς Attic.<sup>1</sup> Homer, however, so far from preserving such an archaic form as \*ῖδῶς, has εἰδῶς forty-five times, and even εἰδνῖα P 5, which, however, can be emended. Though the objection which has been made to Wackernagel's hypothesis, on account of a supposed Homeric form *Fειδνῖα*, cannot be supported on any grounds whatsoever, it is evident that his hypothesis is improbable on chronological grounds, even if the -ος be accepted as an "abgestumpfte Endung." All difficulties would be solved by reading -εἰδος (Dindorf 4, if we may cite so indifferent a text), but

<sup>1</sup>His comparison of *δεῖδια*, Attic *δέδια*, is incorrect, since the εἰ of *δεῖδια* is a mere graphic expression of the long vowel before δ*F*. Many of his etymologies are venturesome, e. g. \**ὄλFυμπος*.

the reading of La Roche, we must admit, has not as yet been satisfactorily disposed of.

νίκη νικάω. 44 times with EI in Kaibel's "Epigrammata." Hsd. Theog. 247 Εὐνείκη in all MSS. E. M. Εὐνείκα (cf. Theocritus XIII 45), a scholar of Sappho; cf. Suidas s.v. Σαπφώ. I regard these forms with *ei* as itacistic. Osthoff (M. U. IV 223) has given a good etymology. Vedic *nici* so νικάω "mache nieder," "lay low." Fick's *ῥνίκη* < *ῥνίκη* *vincio* is not so good.

κλείς, cf. Hom. κλίμαξ κλῆσιν. Alcman 96 κλείτει. Herodian makes in the case of κλείς an exception to his own rule that nouns ending in -*us* have *i* in the preceding syllable. The Etym. Magnum has *ei*. Hesychius κλείτει. Nevertheless in Homer and Antigone 1145 κλείς. Osthoff assumes that both forms are correct and that κλείτει is from κλείς (with this accent) and κλείς from κλῆ-τῆς-. We accept this explanation, as we undoubtedly have *τ* for *ζ* in several words (e. g. στῆβη) in which the *τ* must be pre-Homeric. For others the connection between verbal and substantival stems suffices.

ῥεῖνός. ῥεῖνός CIG II 2415 Paros is of little importance. ῥεῖνός (one *ν*) CIG I 916 Attica. Curtius assumes that from \*ῥεῖνός comes the parallel form \*ῥεῖνός.

ῥηξ. βείρακες· ἱέρακες, Hesychius, is probably itacistic. The etymology of this and other forms is as yet unexplained. Osthoff connects ῥός ῥερός.

πολίτης is said by Meyer to be younger than πολίτης, but the latter is never found on Attic inscriptions of early date and is therefore itacistic. *ei* is found in the first century before and after the birth of Christ. Ὀλβιοπολείτας, πολίτην Byzantium CIG 2060. The same conclusion applies to ὀδίτης.

Under this heading I will insert *αῖρω* and *αἰκῶς*, of which it is commonly said that they are contractions of *αἰέρω* and *αἰκῶς*. This explanation is reasserted by Wackernagel (K. Z. XXV 269). The case of *αἰέρω αῖρω* has been disposed of satisfactorily by Brugmann (K. Z. XXVII 196), who, noticing the difference in the form of contraction between *αἰέρω* (spurious diphthong) and *αἰέδω* (genuine diphthong) assumes a double formation *ῥγ-λω* = *ῥαίρω* and *ῥ-ῥε-λω*.

*αἰκῶς*, Iliad XXII 336, is not from *αἰκῆς αἰκῆς* (as maintained by G. Meyer in addition to Wackernagel), but has the normal weak vowel according to the accent. *αἰκῆς αἰκελίως αἰκέως* (Simon. Ceos. 13), etc., are irregular with their strong forms. Wackernagel (K. Z. XXV 278) writes *αἰκῶς* and takes refuge in his theory of



distraction to *αἰκῶς* despite the parallel instance *αἰδές* (Hesiod, *Aspis* Her. 477). *ἀναιδής* in the famous inscription from Corcyra *ΔΦεινία* τῶδε σᾶμα τὸν ὤλεσε πόντος ἀναιδής is not proof that *αι* did not arise from *αῖ*. To insist upon *αι* as a starting point because of the irregular *αἰκίης*, etc., instead of *αῖ*, is doing violence to the laws of Greek accentuation. Furthermore, *αιικ-* ought to contract *αι*, as *ει* is a genuine diphthong, cf. *ᾄδω*. We have nothing to do with the "Uebergang von *ει* in *τ* vor einem Consonanten" that Fröhde (B. B. III 9) finds so remarkable. *ἔκελος* is a parallel example of accent-shifting changing *ει* to *τ*. Bergk 4 reads *αἰκέλιος* Theognis 1344, and *αῖ* by that time may have become *αι*.

The relation of Homeric *ἰθὺς* to later forms with *ει*, principally in Hesychius, is as yet unexplained. For an elaborate and fanciful explanation by Osthoff see M. U. IV 188.

J. Schmidt (K. Z. XXVI 354) conjectures that as *δῖα* is not feminine to *δῖος*, it can have originated from *\*deivia* and is = *dēvī*, masc. *dēvd-*; this, however, only in case the *ē* of *dēvī* did not force its way in from *dēvd-*. For this group of words (*δῖογενής* *Δῖον* *Δίη* *Πανδίη* in Homer) the old explanation of *δῖα* is satisfactory, though *δῖα* is remarkable.

The relation of Homeric *Ποσειδάων* to later forms with *τ* (*τ* in *Ποσιδίμω* as early as Homer) is peculiar and as yet unexplained. The *ει* form is found in the Attic, Ionic, Aiolic, Boeotian, North-Thessalian, Corinthian dialects, that with *ι* in Ionic, Attic (name of the month), North-Thessalian, Argive, Arcadian and Corinthian dialects.<sup>1</sup> That the diphthong is genuine and original is proved by the Doric ablaut-form *Ποοῖδαia* (Cauer, No. 17). Were the etymology fixed we might consider the claims of the theory that the *ι* in various dialects is from *ει*. That the grammarians did not know what was the archaic form may be learned by comparing La Roche, *Hom. Textkritik*, p. 345. Venetus A has generally *Ποσιδάων*, which is corrected on the margin.

#### VERBS WITH *ῑ* IN HOMER FOR WHICH *ει* IS FOUND IN INSCRIPTIONS OR IN THE LATER LITERATURE.

*ἔκω*.<sup>2</sup> Sappho II 8 οὐδὲν ἔτ' *εἴκει*. *εἴκω* has been improperly assumed by Curtius to be the Doric form (Ahr. II 344). *ἦκω* = *jacio*

<sup>1</sup> The ablaut in *Ποοῖδαia* (Cauer 17) makes it the more certain that there was a Doric form with *ει*. *τ* in the gen. and dat. before *ι* became *σ*. When *σ* stands before *ει* and *αι* it is secondary according to Prellwitz, B. B. IX 331.

<sup>2</sup> Der Diphthong *ΕΙ*, page 13.

has morphologically nothing in common with  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega$ , since  $\eta$  and  $\epsilon\iota$  are never interchangeable in an old form. If Sappho's  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega$  is correct, it is improbable that Homer should have said  $\tilde{\epsilon}\kappa\omega$ .  $\tilde{\iota}\epsilon\omicron$  in Latin is the most plausible etymology for  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\omega$  hitherto adduced, though the spiritus asper presents difficulties.

$\nu\acute{\iota}\phi\epsilon\iota$ .  $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\phi\omega$  is proved to be the old form by Herodian and various well attested readings in Thucydides and Aristophanes, cf. Schmidt, Vocalismus, I 134; Diphthong EI 13. Brugmann (Gr. 119b) believes in a Greek  $\nu\acute{\iota}\phi\omega$  and  $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\phi\omega$ . The former he places under the weak root-forms despite its long vowel.

$\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  is explained by Fröhde as containing  $\tau$  from  $\tau < \epsilon\iota$ . Skt.  $l\acute{ā}ya$  "rest," and  $l\acute{ī}yate$  are compared, and  $\sigma\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$ , Skt.  $ch\acute{ā}yā$  offered as a parallel to  $*\lambda\iota\alpha-$ . An insuperable objection to the comparison of  $l\acute{ā}ya$  with  $\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  is the difference in meaning, and it is not even certain whether  $l\acute{ī}yate$  is connected.

$\pi\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ . The only trace of the  $\epsilon\iota$  form that I have been able to discover is in the gloss of Hesychius  $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  \*  $\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ , which is a poor guarantee for the authenticity of the diphthongal orthography. In Homer we find  $\pi\acute{\tau}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\pi\acute{\tau}\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu$ ,  $\pi\acute{\tau}\omega$ :  $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ .  $\Pi\acute{\tau}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  has the proethnic long vowel ( $\phi\acute{\iota}yate$  in Sanskrit)  $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  from  $\pi\omega F\omega$ , Vedic  $p\acute{in}vān\acute{a}s$   $p\acute{in}vati$ , cf.  $\delta\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$   $\eta\eta\nu\acute{a}t\iota$ .  $\pi\acute{\iota}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$  and  $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  are two forms for expressing the same idea, but are to be referred to coexistent roots of different form.

$\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$  (thesis 3 times, arsis 30),  $\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ ,  $\tau\epsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ , etc.,  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .

$\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  Homer and Theognis.

$\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\mu\alpha\iota$  often written  $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\mu-$  in MSS, cf.  $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\acute{\nu}\omega$  in Plutarch.

$\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$  (15 times) also Attic,  $\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ , etc.,  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ .

$\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  from Pindar on.

$\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\acute{\nu}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$  Eurip.

For  $*\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omega$  we have numerous epigraphic proofs from various dialects dating from the fifth century. These I have collected, "Diphthong EI," page 17.<sup>1</sup> The relation of the forms with long and short vowel is involved in no inconsiderable obscurity, and as no definite conclusion as to their interrelation has as yet been reached, I will summarize the most recent theories on the subject before giving my own explanation.<sup>2</sup>

(1) Curtius, Verbum<sup>2</sup> (1877). The old form had the diphthong

<sup>1</sup> Meisterhans, p. 88, says the verbal forms in  $\epsilon\iota$  are from  $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ . There is no epigraphic example of  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omega$ . Futures and aorists with  $\epsilon\iota$  are very common. The perfect  $\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu$  is Delphic.

<sup>2</sup> The same holds good of  $\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\omega$   $\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\omega$ , Homeric  $\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ , Pindar Attic  $\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ .

( $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega = c\acute{a}ye$ ), but judging from the testimony of the Homeric verse, the diphthong before vowels must have yielded in Ionic to the long vowel at a very early date, otherwise we could not account for the short vowel in Homer which became universal in Attic.  $\tauίνω$  has its long vowel from the influence of the conjugational sign  $\nu$ :  $\tau\tilde{\iota}-\nu\acute{\omega}$   $\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu\omega$   $\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu\omega$   $\tauίνω$   $\tauίνω$ . Curtius does not hold that  $\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu\omega$  could produce both  $\tauίνω$  and  $\tauίνω$ , but that  $\tauίνω$  originated from  $\tauίνω$ .  $\tauίννμαι$  and not  $\tauίννμαι$  is the correct form in Homer. Perhaps the original form was  $*\tauείνμαι$ .

(2) Brugmann (then Brugman) K. Z. XXIV 261.  $\tauίννμαι$  (Eurip.) is older than  $\tauίννμαι$  (Homer) because it is parallel to  $c\acute{\iota}n\acute{o}l\acute{\iota}$ , having the weak form:  $\tauίννμαι : *τίννμι : \xi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\mu\iota : *\xi\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\mu\iota$ .  $\tauίνω$  arose from the change of the  $-\mu$  to the  $-\omega$  conjugation:  $\tauίνω$  is therefore older than  $\tauίνω$  as  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\tilde{\iota}\tau\omega\varsigma$  is older than  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\tilde{\iota}\tau\omega\varsigma$ , which received its  $\tau$  from the analogy of  $\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\omega$   $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\tilde{\iota}\sigma\alpha$  with their old  $\tau$  ( $\epsilon\iota$ ). Brugmann appears here to accept the reduction of  $\epsilon\iota$  to  $\tau$ .  $\tauίνω$  is not from  $*\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu\omega$   $*\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu\omega$ , because the relation of  $\tauίνω$  to  $\tauίνω$  cannot be considered apart from that of  $*\tauίννμι$  to  $*\tauίννμι$ , and as  $\tauίννμι$  is the older form,  $\tauίνω$  must be younger. Brugmann (Gramm. §121) accepts Osthoff's explanation of the parallel forms  $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$  and  $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$  given later on, and distinctly rejects the form  $\tau\epsilon\iota-\acute{\iota}\omega$ , for which see below. Gramm. §57 he declares  $\tauίνω$  to be from  $*\tauίν\omega$ .

(3) G. Meyer (Griech. Gramm. 1880). §293,  $\tauίνω$  from  $*\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu\acute{\omega}$   $*\tau\tilde{\iota}\nu\omega$ . §113,  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  is the older and more correct orthography; from  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  comes  $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$  by itacism. §499,  $\tauίνω$  (or  $\tauείνω$ ) in conformity with  $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$   $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ .  $\tauίννμαι = \tauείννμαι$ .  $\tauίνω$  is compared, §499, with  $c\acute{\iota}n\acute{o}m\acute{\iota}$ . Meyer therefore believes that  $\tauίνω$  is not weakened from  $\tauίνω$  and that the  $\tau$  of  $\tauίνω$  has nothing to do with the  $\tau$  of  $\tauίνω$ . Meyer's exact position is difficult to discover.

(4) Osthoff's (M. U. IV 36, 1880) explanation depends on his entire theory of the relation of  $\epsilon\iota$ - $\tilde{\iota}$ - $\acute{\iota}$ .  $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega = c\acute{\iota}yate$ .  $\tau\acute{\iota}\omega$  is also proethnic.  $\tauίννμαι$   $\tauίνω$  and  $\tauίννμαι$   $\tauίνω$  contain proethnic vowels, cf. Skt.  $c\acute{\iota}n\acute{o}m\acute{\iota}$ , Zend  $c\acute{\iota}nao\acute{\varsigma}$ .  $\tau\epsilon\iota-$  and  $\tau\tilde{\iota}-$  should not be confounded in Greek, since  $\tau\tilde{\iota}$  belongs originally to all those verbal and nominal forms which had  $\tau\tilde{\iota}$  in accordance with the laws of Indo-European ablaut (*i. e.* as formulated by Osthoff). The  $\tau$  asserted itself where  $\epsilon\iota$  belonged, *e. g.* in the future and sigmatic aorist.  $\epsilon\iota$  extended itself into the province of  $\tau$  or  $\tau$  ( $\xi\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega$  in the Arcadian dialect).  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  is a new formation for  $\tau\tilde{\iota}\omega$  or for  $*\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  and is not  $= c\acute{a}yate$ .  $\tau\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\eta}$  and  $\tau\tilde{\iota}\mu\acute{\eta}$  arose from the I. E. stem-change  $c\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\imath}m\acute{a}$ - and  $c\acute{\imath}m\acute{a}$ -.

(5) J. Schmidt (K. Z. XXVII 295, 1883) does not discuss the

entire question. Forms with *ει* before a vowel are analogical formations from tenses where *ει* is followed by a consonant. *ἔσταισι* (Arcadian) is a young form for *ἔστῃσι*; the *ει* is due to the influence of future or aorist forms. *φθείω* has its diphthong from *φθείσσονται*. Schmidt does not make clear what was the form of the present, of which *φθείσσονται* is the future. For an *ει* in fut. or aorist we must have an *ει* in present, else how could the future have *ει*; on what form can it be dependent? Schmidt does not use his theory of accent-gradations (K. Z. XXV) to explain any of these forms. As regards *τείω*, which I hold to be the Homeric form, I have given an explanation (Diphthong EI, pp. 16, 17) differing from the above mentioned, in that I have supposed those verbs that have *ει* before -ω to have preserved their diphthongal character by the insertion of an infix jod between the root and the ending. J. Schmidt formulates a law that no diphthong can maintain itself before a vowel *which originally* followed it, except in the Aiolic dialect. This law I sought then to obviate by the assumption of a jod infix which would annihilate the distinction between Aiolic and the other dialects. *ρέω* (Aiolic *ρεύω*) is \**ρέFω* < *ρέύω*, *νείω* is *νεύjω* otherwise *νέω* as *ρέω* *τείω* \**τέω*. This theory alone can save the diphthongs of such verbs as *τείω* *φθείω*, etc.; that it is open to grave objections I do not fail to recognize. What I have said (Diphthong EI) in reference to *τείjω* = \**céyatī* is of doubtful validity, since those verbs of the fourth Skt. class with accented root-syllables have unoriginal accent and original weak root-forms. If the form *τείω* is Homeric, it is necessary to explain *τίω* and *τῷω* either from it or by some other process. Putting Osthoff's theory aside, I will point out what I think to be the difficulty of Curtius' explanation. Curtius rends asunder the *τ* of *τίννμαι* and that of *τίνω*; since *τίνω* has its long *τ* from the influence of that very *νν* which we find in *τίννμαι*. *τίννμαι* must therefore be for *τείννμαι*, therefore it can have no similarity to *cinōmi*, unless it be ranked with such forms as *ζεύγνυμι* *δείκνυμι* with unoriginal strong root. For those who accept the ictus-theory *in extenso* there is an escape from the unfortunate *τ* of *τίννμαι*, in that very good MSS have *τίνννμαι*, the antepenultimate syllable appearing under the ictus, cf. also *τιννύω*, though little can be proved by an example occurring in Plutarch.

To have recourse here to the theory of metrical compulsion has always seemed to me unjustifiable, and though I believe, as before mentioned, in the possibility of metrical necessity creating certain hexameters which appear to be irregular if we compare

them with the generality of verses, we stand on a surer foundation in accepting a *non liquet* in the case of a form like *τίννμαι*, the peculiarity of which seems to have escaped notice, rather than read *τίννμαι* as a *dernier ressort*.<sup>1</sup> That another explanation is possible will be seen later on. It suffices here to have called attention to this weakness of Curtius' position: that *τίννμαι* is separated from *τίνω*. According to Brugmann the two systems with long and 'short vowel have supplemented each other when *τίνω* came into existence from *τίσω* (cf. Aiolic *φιλῆω* from *φιλῆσω*, etc.; *δείκνυμι* from *δείξω*, etc.) and the parallelism of quantities was extended to the other members:

<i>τίννμαι</i>	
* <i>τίννμι</i>	<i>τίνω</i>
<i>τίνω</i>	<i>ἄτῑτος</i>
<i>ἄτῑτος</i>	<i>τίννμαι</i>

This does not necessitate us to give up the root *τει*: \**τειννμαί* = *τίννμαι* with later accent. *τίω* might have resulted from the same analogy as *τίνω*. This Brugmann has not seen, or at least fails to mention. The relation of *φθειώ* and *φθῑω*, *φθίνω* Hom. *φθῑνω* Pindar and Attic is similar. So far Brugmann's theory seems somewhat plausible, nevertheless there is a fatal difficulty: the separation of the *-άνω* (Attic *-ᾶνω*) verbs from those in *-ίνω*, Attic *-ῑνω*.<sup>2</sup> This Wackernagel has pointed out (K. Z. XXV 262) and proved by calling to our attention the fact that, as *φθάνω* cannot be separated from *τίνω*, if *τίνω* received its *τ* from the aorist, *φθάνω* must have received from the same tense an *η*, \**ἔφθηνα*, cf. *ἔφηνα*, etc., and thus have been *φθῑνω*. Brugmann's theory is therefore overthrown, and I see no surer method of criticism than to accept the situation, leaving *τίννμαι* unexplained, if the following explanation by analogy does not please. The long vowel in a form originally requiring the short, may have been generated by a systematization of the group:

* <i>τιννμέν</i>	* <i>τίννμαί</i>
* <i>τινντέ</i>	* <i>τίννσαι</i>
* <i>τινφόντι</i>	* <i>τίννται</i>

From \**τινφόντι* \**τινφω* \**τίννω* *τίνω* and *τῑνω*. To the new *τ* forms *τίνω*, etc., *τίννμαι*, etc., may have been assimilated. Nor does this

<sup>1</sup> De Saussure, *Mélanges Graux*, p. 745, says that *σκεδάωννυμεν* "redouble sans doute son *ν* uniquement parce que \**σκεδάωννυμεν* renfermait une succession de trois brèves."

<sup>2</sup> In his *Grammar*, § 130, he reverts to the explanation of *τῑνω* from *τίνφω*.

explanation necessitate our abandoning  $\tau\epsilon\iota$  as the original strong form ( $\tau\epsilon\iota-\nu\upsilon-\mu\alpha\iota = \tau\acute{\iota}\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ ). For the derivation of verbs in  $-\nu\omega$  from the third person plural cf. Bezzenger, Beiträge, Vol. IX, " $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  and  $\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\omega}$ ."

$\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\omega$  μετακτῖαθον  $\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ <sup>1</sup> and  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\omega$  are to be explained in the same way as  $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$   $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\mu\alpha\iota$ . Verbs in  $-\acute{\nu}\epsilon\omega$  as parallels to those in  $-\nu\omega$  are not uncommon. The theory of diphthongal reduction in this group is therefore invalidated.

$\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\omega$  Homer, Attic  $\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\iota}\omega$ . The antepenult is probably long in Homer; it occurs only in the imperfect.  $\acute{\iota}\delta\omicron\varsigma$  for the first time in Hesiod., Homer  $\acute{\iota}\delta\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ , Skt. *svidyāmi svedas*, Lat. *sudor* < *svoidor*, Old Norse *sveiti*, O. H. G. *sveiz* attest the antiquity of the diphthongal form. I believe here we must assume the existence of a root with long vowel. Sievers has shown that in Skt. and Germanic short *ya*-stems had a consonantal *y* in the suffix, while long *ya*-stems had the vowel *i*,<sup>2</sup> cf. Skt. *aryá* and *kāviá*. After  $\sqrt{\sigma F\tau\delta}$  we have  $\acute{\iota}-\omega$  (the Attic form must be later). Compare *speṭ- $\acute{\iota}\omega$  siṭ- $\acute{\iota}\omega$*  as explained by Osthoff.

$\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$  of the sixth century (Kaibel, No. 1), a form proved to be Attic and introduced into the text of Aeschylus by Kirchhoff, must not be taken to be a case of the reduction of  $\epsilon\iota$  to  $\iota$ , nor must one assert that  $\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$  is the Homeric form.  $\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$  is  $*\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\jmath}\omega$ ;  $\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$  is  $*\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\rho\acute{\jmath}\omega$  with the "schwa" form in  $\omicron\iota\kappa\tau\rho\acute{\sigma}\varsigma$ .

$\acute{\omega}\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  appears in the itacistic form  $\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$  CIG 1156 Argos;  $\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$  in an epigram from Pompeii (Dilthey Epigr. gr. Pomp. repert. trias Turici, 1876). Verbs in  $-\nu\omega$  in Greek with  $\tau$  preceding are to be explained as either from  $-\nu F\omega$  or  $\nu\acute{\jmath}\omega$ , when the future has the short vowel then from  $-\nu\acute{\jmath}\omega$ . This is denied by Osthoff (M. U. IV 49) who, to prove the contrary, must have recourse to several most improbable formations by analogy.  $\acute{\omega}\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  is like  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  ( $\delta\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\omega$ ), Aiolic  $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ ,  $\kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ , etc.

If Lith. *grėju* is a congener of  $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\omega$ , the latter should be  $\chi\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega$ ; if Skt. *ghārshāmi* the  $\tau$  is original and from  $*\chi\acute{\iota}\rho\sigma\omega$ . The latter explanation is correct. Further examples of  $\tau$  Schmidt, Vocal. II 332. There is no indication of an  $\epsilon\iota$  form in Greek;  $\chi\rho\omicron\iota\eta$  is to be separated from this group.

$\acute{\zeta}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$   $\acute{\zeta}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ , Wackernagel, K. Z. XXV 279, says are incorrect

<sup>1</sup> Old Bulg. *si-na* should not be adduced as a proof that the  $\acute{\tau}$  of Homeric  $\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\omega$  is proethnic.

<sup>2</sup> "Unaccented *i* (or *u*) before a vowel acts as a consonant after a short, as a vowel after a long syllable without respect to any other accent-position the word may have." Paul-Braune, V 129.

forms for  $\epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$   $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu$ . G. Meyer (Gram. §591) proposes to read  $\gamma$  365 " $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\nu$  for  $\iota\mu\epsilon\nu$ ." Munro (Hom. Gram. §80) asserts that the long  $\iota$  may stand for  $\epsilon\iota$ , though in the subj. we expect the longer form of the stem; §384  $\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  from the shortening of a long vowel before a vowel. The fact that the shorter root of this verb may appear in Skt. with a short vowel when compounded in the optative with a preposition, with the long vowel when uncompounded, has no immediate bearing upon the Greek formation. Curtius says (Verb.<sup>2</sup> I 180) perhaps  $\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota < \iota\epsilon\text{-}\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ ;  $\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  Curtius cannot explain. His adoption of Kägî's proposal that  $\tau$  is  $< \iota\gamma\text{-}$  (to which jod reference has already been made in the section concerning  $-\tau\eta$ ), is but half-hearted. It is improbable that no connection should exist between the  $\tau$  of  $\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$  and  $\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ . How does Wackernagel explain that  $\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  came into the text instead of  $\epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ ? We have as yet not seen any reasons adduced by any scholar showing the cause of the substitution. There is furthermore no escape by the explanation of false transcription. All attempts to show *why*  $\epsilon\iota$  was displaced have proved futile. It is not my purpose to attempt to clear up the mystery of the  $\tau$  in these two words, but the fact that  $\iota$  appears but 8 times long in  $\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ , 21 times short, and 12 times short in other subjunctive forms,  $\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$  but once,  $\iota\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$  thrice (one verse being an interpolation), makes it not improbable that we have to do with a metrical license in the case of the infinitive, while  $\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  is less clear, since even adherents of the metrical compulsion theory demur to the assumption that a vowel can be lengthened or shortened before another vowel, while there are 111 cases of a vowel lengthening before  $\mu$ . Whatever difficulties the explanation of the  $\tau$  in the subjunctive (which expects the strong form) may present, they are not to be compared to those thrown in our way by  $\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ . It does not suffice to say "false form; read  $\epsilon\iota\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ " without explaining the secret of the substitution.<sup>1</sup> Some offer the feeble defence that  $\epsilon\iota$  may become  $\tau$  before a foll. vowel, though they must be aware of the fact that this is not the general mode of diphthongal reduction; the shifting of accent being one cause of the reduction whereby  $\epsilon$  is expelled;  $\pi\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\nu$   $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu$  offers an instance of the other

<sup>1</sup> Osthoff's comparison of the long  $\bar{i}$  of  $\bar{i}\gamma\bar{a}m$   $\bar{i}\gamma\bar{a}sam$  with that of  $\bar{i}\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$  is inconceivable. Where is there a trace of  $*\bar{i}\eta\nu$  in the optative, not to speak of the difference of moods? Skt.  $\acute{a}yat$   $\acute{á}yatí$  lead us to expect the  $\epsilon\iota$  form. Furthermore, this very form is found in Sophron.  $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$   $\epsilon\iota\omega$  (Hesiod. Op. 617  $\epsilon\iota\eta$  has been read  $\epsilon\iota\eta$ ; Lehrs 'möge gehen'; Rzach  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\omega$  conj. of Haupt, but the state of the text is such that no great reliance can be placed upon it, though remarkable enough; cf. Ahrens, II 340.

mode. I believe in this case, even if the *metri licentia* theory be rejected, the burden of proof is thrown upon the shoulders of its rejectors. Certainly Brugmann's (Gramm. §142) assertion that the τ is from analogy to στήομεν, etc., which he assumes to be unoriginal forms, is not convincing. εἶομεν would be parallel to στήομεν.

As regards the assumed long τ (*naturā*) of Homeric μίσγω, if the vowel be really long, no certain explanation has been given; the assumption of a form μίγγ-σκω, in which the second guttural is the product of the assimilation of the guttural of the root to the ν of νν (cf. μίγνυμι), although put forward by Schmidt, is undemonstrable. We naturally ask the question what has become of the vowel of νν, which Schmidt does not answer. But in μέμγμαι μίξω the vowel is also supposed to be long, if we accept the consensus of testimony of the Greeks. The same is held to be the case in μίκτο. The existence of ει-forms on old inscriptions (Μεῖξιος, συνμείξας Μειξίας might lead to the supposition that there existed a form μείγνυμι, which is adopted by Curtius (Verbum<sup>2</sup> I 165) and by Riemann (Revue de Philologie, V 172). But such a form is contrary to the laws of Greek accentuation, even though we find such irregularities as δείκνυμι ξεύγνυμι. Brugmann's remark (Grammar, p. 7) is in a certain sense here applicable: "nicht aber dürfen unerklärte Ausnahmen zur Grundlage von Schlüssen gemacht werden, welche die sonst beobachtete Konsequenz der spontanen Lautbewegungen aufheben sollen." The adoption of a form \*μείσγω (μεικ-σκω) is clearly in opposition to the laws governing inchoative formations, and also to the Latin *misceo*. While deference to the authority of the "natural length" of the ι in μίσγω as attested by the Greek grammarians has not been paid by many writers, it is *a priori* incredible that in this single case a diphthongal root should have suffered reduction. Nor is there any ground for asserting that the expulsion of the final consonant of the root should have produced compensatory lengthening. In no other instance has the vowel been lengthened. The forms with ει (cf. Diphthong EI, p. 21) are either verbal, depending on an aorist ἔμειξας, or substantival depending on the same strong tense. They presuppose a present \*μείγω, which never existed in Greek since the inchoative formation is proethnic, and together with the νν-form, asserts itself in Greek μίγω, to which formation Et. Gudianum, 587, 29 and Anecd. Cram. I 273, 15 offer a weak support. Can the grammarians have been misled in stating that the ι of μίσγω,<sup>1</sup> etc., is long? I do not see

<sup>1</sup> No statement is made by the grammarians that μίγνυμι has ĭ, though we should infer it from μίσγω.



that any means of proof can be adduced either that such was the case or that it was not, though probability speaks for an error. It has been my intention in so tentative an examination to collect the material and to refrain from assertions that savor of dogmatism. The fact that certain Slavic verbs in *-na* have a long root-vowel, does not therefore force me into a statement that the *ι* of *μίσγνμι* is a similar case of proethnic irregularity.

The result of this investigation may be summarized as follows : In a majority of the instances adduced by Meyer, Fröhde, and in the new cases brought forward by myself as offering a supposed proof of the correctness of the theory hitherto generally accepted, a fair case has been made out against the assumption of the reduction of *ε* to *ι*. I. In adverbs from substantival stems, in the dative-locative case-ending, and in many nouns and verbs the change of *ε* to *ι* has been disputed. II. We have accepted as cases of the monophthongization *-τῑ*, *-ῑη*, *-ῑας*. III. There remain several substantival and verbal formations for which a satisfactory explanation was not reached (*Πολύιδος*, *χῑλιοι*, *μίσγω*, etc.) Stress must be laid upon the fact that the root-syllable is the least, if at all affected, while suffix-forms, which adapt the root to particular purposes, are more readily exposed to weakening, even though they are bearers of the chief accent. Greek and Germanic are herein different ; in the latter it is the unaccented syllables which are mutilated.

It is no new truth that in dealing with questions which depend for their solution to a greater or less degree upon pronunciation, the *errare est humanum* is peculiarly applicable. We are inclined to treat forms of Greek grammar as if from the time of Homer on they were pronounced with undeviating regularity. Every law in language has, as every art, its chronological conditions. A combination of sound retains its peculiar character, if it has been produced after the cessation of the operation of a law, which, if still active, would have necessitated an alteration. So, it is because the pronunciation of the Greeks, varied as it must have been by time and by dialect influence, cannot be resuscitated that we fail to explain many forms, and if such words as *χῑλια* in Homer and *χῑλλιοι* in Aïolic, *χῑλιοι* in Boeotian seem incompatible with each other, as a *dernier ressort* we may take refuge in the fluctuation of pronunciation in particular words which undoubtedly had its influence upon orthography, and beg the indulgence of those who demand absolute conformity with phonetic law.

HERBERT WEIR SMYTH.

November 6th, 1885.